

REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-13 and 16-50 are pending in the present application. No claims have been added and no claims are cancelled. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-13 and 16-50 will be pending.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the telephone interview granted by the Examiner to Applicants' representative, Shandon W. Herring, on July 15, 2010. In the interview, the claims and the prior art were discussed.

In particular, Applicants' representative proposed amending independent claim 1 to recite that displaying the composite video stream includes displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents. Agreement was reached with regard the claims. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment overcomes the cited art. The claims are amended herein consistently with the discussion during the telephone examiner interview. Accordingly, the rejection of the claims as unpatentable over the cited art should be withdrawn. Additionally, the Examiner agreed to call Applicants' attorneys, Gregory A. Hunt or Shandon Herring, at (919) 493-8000 to conduct a subsequent telephone interview to resolve any outstanding issues.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13, 16-40, 46, 47, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,353,450 to DeLeeuw (hereinafter, "DeLeeuw") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,595,820 to Martins et al. (hereinafter, "Martins"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 16, 31, 35 and 39 recite methods, computer-readable media, and a system for controlling a computer using at least one video image of a plurality of video images. For example, claim 1 recites a method including capturing n video streams, n being an integer of at least two, the n video streams each comprising a plurality of video frames and each comprising video of a different user. The method also includes determining a location of an object in at least one of the n video streams. The method further includes controlling a program executing on the computer based on the location of the object. The method also includes combining, at a single computer, the n video streams with a user interface stream generated by a computer operating system, thereby forming a composite video stream, providing the composite video stream for display to each of the different users, and displaying the composite video stream.

Each of independent claims 1, 16, 31, 35, and 39 has been amended to recite that displaying the composite video stream includes displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 13, line 3 through page 14, line 5, as well as Figure 6 of the instant specification.

DeLeeuw and Martins fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that combining the n video streams and user interface stream includes displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents, as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 31, 35, and 39. DeLeeuw is directed to a system and apparatus for displaying a video stream and inserting a transparent user interface element into captured video data signals. This renders the scene transparently visible on the display, and generates an input signal for the system in response to a detection of the object over, or at least partially coinciding with, the at least one transparent user interface element. (See Abstract of DeLeeuw.) The system and apparatus in DeLeeuw allows a user see a reflected image of himself or herself on the screen, while at the same time being able to see and interact with other display elements. (See DeLeeuw, col. 2, lines 53-67.) DeLeeuw only discloses one video stream combined with one captured video data signal. (See Figures 1, 3, and 18, as well as col. 3, lines 54-58.) As understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, the ability to combine two or more video streams of different users with a user interface stream, as recited in claim 1, yields benefits unattainable by the disclosure in DeLeeuw. For example, the method of claim 1 allows multiple users in different locations to be able to see each other interact with desktop contents on the same screen, which is useful in collaborations. (See Figure 6 of the present specification.)

Martins also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest combining the n video streams and user interface stream includes displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact

with desktop contents. Martins is directed to a method and system for generating a quality measure based on statistics for a tracked object. The quality measure is used to maximize saturation of the tracked objects. The method and system also tune a video camera to increase the quality measure. (See Abstract of Martins.) Martins discloses a camera of the type available for personal computers for video chat. (See Martins, col. 3, lines 64-67.) While video chat allows a user to see another user in a remote location, Martins contains absolutely no mention or suggestion of displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents.

Moreover, a combination of DeLeeuw and Martins results in a display having a single user's reflection on a desktop along with a video chat application for communicating with a remote user. As such, the display of DeLeeuw and Martins would not allow images of the different users to be on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents. Therefore, the display of DeLeeuw and Martins does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features recited in the independent claims.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-13, 16-40, 46, 47, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over DeLeeuw in view of Martins should be withdrawn.

Claims 41-45, 48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DeLeeuw in view of Martins, as applied to claims 1-13, 16-40, 46, 47, and 49, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,278,107 to Price (hereinafter, "Price"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 41-45, 48 and 50 depend on independent claims 1, 16, 31, 35, and 39. As stated above, DeLeeuw and Martins fail to teach, disclose, or suggest displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents. Price likewise fails to disclose this feature. Price is directed to a method, system, and program product for managing windows in a network-based collaborative meeting. The disclosure in Price allows a target application window and a meeting application window to be viewed simultaneously without requiring repositioning or re-sizing of either window. Price further discloses that a meeting application window is accessed pertaining to a collaborative meeting, a portion of the meeting application window is removed, and a target application is viewed through the removed portion of the meeting application window. Price does not mention video streams in general, and in particular does not mention that displaying images of the different users on or behind a desktop interface and allowing the images of the different users to interact with desktop contents. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 41-45, 48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over DeLeeuw in view of Martins in view of Price should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has

had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. 50-0426.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A.

Date: July 16, 2010

By:


Shandon W. Herring
Registration No. 60,198
Customer No. 25297

421/79 PCT/US GAH/SWH/JWT/trb